

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 5-8 and 13-16 are now pending in this application.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Informational Disclosure Statement

Although Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the Information Disclosure Statement (“IDS”) filed June 3, 2005, Applicant also respectfully continues to request an indication that the Examiner has considered the reference submitted with the IDS filed on December 15, 2003. Of course, such an indication may be provided by way of Examiner initials on the form PTO/SB/08 that was submitted along with the IDS.

Claim of Foreign Priority

Applicant also respectfully continues to request that the next communication issued by the Patent Office include an acknowledgment of the claim of foreign priority and that the certified copy of the priority document was received. The certified copy of JP 2002-363703 (which was filed in Japan on December 16, 2002) was submitted with the instant application on December 15, 2003.

Rejection of Claims 5-6 and 13-16 based on Schrotte, Katou, and Stewart

Claims 5-6 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,112,585 (“Schrotte”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,705,155 (“Katou”) and U.S. Patent 7,010,968 (“Stewart ‘968”). For at least the following reasons this rejection is traversed.

Claim 5 recites “at least two receivers...wherein each of the receivers is configured to: (a) receive and demodulate the tire pressure data transmitted by the transmitters; and (b) detect and transmit a reception level of the received and demodulated tire pressure data.” Schrotte, Katou, Stewart ‘968, or any combination thereof fails to teach or suggest these features.

In particular, Schrotte merely teaches the use of antennae, which the PTO has considered to be the two receivers of claim 5. As admitted by the PTO, Schrotte does not teach the demodulation of the tire pressure data signals at the individual receivers. (Page 3 of the Office Action.) PTO states that “Stewart et al...disclose[s] the teaching of receiving and demodulating tire pressure data/signals in a receiver, see col 5, lines 45-50.” (Page 3 of the Office Action.) Applicant respectfully disagrees because Stewart ‘968 clearly states that the RF detector 112 explicitly does not demodulate the signals. For example, Stewart ‘968 states “[T]he RF detector 112 does not demodulate the data transmitted by the tire monitor 106. Only the RF circuit 120 of the control unit 110 demodulates the data to extract the contents of the RF signal 106. The RF detector only senses the presence of the transmitted RF signals.” (Column 8, lines 12-18 of Stewart ‘968.) The control unit 110 is a central processor that detects and demodulates signals from a variety of RF detectors 112. (Column 4, lines 60-62.) Thus, Stewart ‘968 merely teaches a variety of RF detectors connected to a single controller that has a demodulating component but does not teach a variety of receivers in which each receiver has a demodulating component. Indeed, Stewart ‘968 even teaches away from having a demodulating component at the individual detectors because Stewart ‘968 states that the RF detector only senses the presence of the transmitted RF signals because “[t]his reduces the cost of the RF detectors 112 and the overall cost of the remote tire monitor system 100.” (Column 8, lines 12-18 of Stewart ‘968.) Thus, Stewart ‘968 actually teaches away from using a plurality of demodulating components. At best, Stewart ‘968 merely suggests a single demodulation unit connected to a variety of receivers not a demodulation unit at each receiver. Thus, any combination of Schrotte and Stewart ‘968 does not teach or suggest at least two receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data.

Additionally, Katou does not cure this deficiency. In particular, Katou teaches transmitters 1-4 that transmit encoded and modulated signals that are subsequently received by antennas 21, 22. (Column 3, lines 36-38; column 6, lines 46-47 of Katou.) In turn, the antennas 21, 22 induce a voltage that corresponds to the field strength of the radio signal and send a signal that represents the induced voltage to a central receiver 5. (Column 6, lines 48-64 of Katou.) A reception circuit 24 in the central processor 5 decodes and demodulates the signals representing the induced voltage. (Column 7, lines 8-11 of Katou.) Again, as in Stewart ‘968, Katou teaches demodulation solely in a central processor 5 not by the

individual transmitters 1-4. In other words, Katou fails to teach or suggest individual receivers that are configured to receive and demodulate tire pressure data/signals, as recited in claim 5. Thus, any combination of Schrotte, Stewart '968, and Katou does not teach or suggest at least two receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data as required by claim 5. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable over the prior art.

Claim 13 recites “a plurality of receivers...wherein each of the receivers is configured to: (a) receive and demodulate the tire pressure data transmitted by the transmitters; and (b) detect and transmit a reception level of the received and demodulated tire pressure data.” Schrotte, Katou, Stewart '968, or any combination thereof fails to teach or suggest these features. As previously mentioned, Schrotte does not teach the demodulation of the tire pressure data signals at the individual receivers; Stewart '968 merely teaches a variety of RF detectors connected to a single controller that has a demodulating component but does not teach a variety of receivers in which each receiver has a demodulating component; Stewart '968 teaches away from having a demodulating component at the individual detectors; and Katou fails to teach or suggest individual receivers that are configured to receive and demodulate tire pressure data/signals. Thus, any combination of Schrotte, Stewart '968, and Katou does not teach or suggest a plurality of receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data as required by claim 13. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 13 is not rendered unpatentable over the prior art.

Claims 6 and 14-16 depend from and contain all the limitations of either claim 5 or claim 13, and allowable therewith for at least the same reasons provided above without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 5, 7-8, and 13-16 based on Normann, Katou, and Stewart

Claims 5, 7-8, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,018,993 (“Normann”) in view of Katou and Stewart '968. For at least the following reasons this rejection is traversed.

Claim 5 recites “at least two receivers...wherein each of the receivers is configured to: (a) receive and demodulate the tire pressure data transmitted by the transmitters; and (b)

detect and transmit a reception level of the received and demodulated tire pressure data.” Normann, Katou, Stewart ‘968, or any combination thereof fails to teach or suggest these features.

In particular, Normann merely teaches the use of antennae, which the PTO has considered to be the two receivers of claim 5. As admitted by the PTO, Normann does not teach the demodulation of the tire pressure data signals at the individual receivers. (Page 5 of the Office Action.) PTO states that “Stewart et al...disclose[s] the teaching of receiving and demodulating tire pressure data/signals in a receiver, see col 5, lines 45-50.” (Page 5 of the Office Action.) Applicant respectfully disagrees because, as previously mentioned, Stewart ‘968 merely teaches a variety of RF detectors connected to a single controller that has a demodulating component but does not teach a variety of receivers in which each receiver has a demodulating component. Indeed, Stewart ‘968 even teaches away from having a demodulating component at the individual detectors (Column 8, lines 12-18 of Stewart ‘968.) Thus, Stewart ‘968 actually teaches away from using a plurality of demodulating components. At best, Stewart ‘968 merely suggests a single demodulation unit connected to a variety of receivers not a demodulation unit at each receiver. Thus, any combination of Normann and Stewart ‘968 does not teach or suggest at least two receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data.

Additionally, Katou does not cure this deficiency because, as previously mentioned, Katou teaches demodulation solely in a central processor 5 not by the individual transmitters 1-4. In other words, Katou fails to teach or suggest individual receivers that are configured to receive and demodulate tire pressure data/signals, as recited in claim 5. Thus, any combination of Normann, Stewart ‘968, and Katou does not teach or suggest at least two receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data as required by claim 5. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable over the prior art.

Claim 13 recites “a plurality of receivers...wherein each of the receivers is configured to: (a) receive and demodulate the tire pressure data transmitted by the transmitters; and (b) detect and transmit a reception level of the received and demodulated tire pressure data.” Normann, Katou, Stewart ‘968, or any combination thereof fails to teach or suggest these features. As previously mentioned, Normann does not teach the demodulation of the tire pressure data signals at the individual receivers; Stewart ‘968 merely teaches a variety of RF

detectors connected to a single controller that has a demodulating component but does not teach a variety of receivers in which each receiver has a demodulating component; Stewart '968 teaches away from having a demodulating component at the individual detectors; and Katou fails to teach or suggest individual receivers that are configured to receive and demodulate tire pressure data/signals. Thus, any combination of Normann, Stewart '968, and Katou does not teach or suggest a plurality of receivers in which each receiver is configured to receive and demodulate the tire pressure data as required by claim 13. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 13 is not rendered unpatentable over the prior art.

Claims 7-8 and 14-16 depend from and contain all the limitations of either claim 5 or claim 13, and allowable therewith for at least the same reasons provided above without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claim 6 based on Normann, Katou, Stewart, and Stewart

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normann in view of Katou and Stewart '968, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003-0297603 ("Stewart '603). For at least the following reasons this rejection is traversed. Claim 6 depends from and contains all the limitations of claim 5. As previously mentioned, claim 5 is not rendered unpatentable over Normann, Katou, and Stewart '968. Stewart '603 does not cure this deficiency. Thus, claim 6 is allowable therewith for at least the same reasons as claim 5 without regards to the further patentable features contained therein. For at least this reason, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/10/2007

By Matthew J. Kremer

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Matthew J. Kremer
Registration No. 58,671